

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 28, 2010, was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-31 were pending in this application prior to the instant amendment, of which claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 27-31 were previously withdrawn from consideration. By this amendment, claims 4-6, 10-14 and 26 are amended, claim 32 is added, and withdrawn claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 27-31 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 3-6, 9-26 and 32 are currently pending for consideration.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-6, 10-14 and 26 stand objected to as being dependent on claims which are withdrawn. In response to this objection, Applicants herein amend claims 4-6 and 26 to be dependent on pending claim 3, and claims 10-14 to be dependent on pending claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these objections.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 3-6 and 9-14. Claims 16-18, 21 and 24-26 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, for the reasons discussed herein, Applicants submit that independent claim 15, upon which claims 16-18, 21, 24 and 25 either directly or indirectly rely, is allowable. New claim 32 is also believed to be allowable by virtue of its dependence on claim 15, and because it recites a similar feature as otherwise allowable claim 26. Claim 26 has been rewritten to depend upon allowed claim 3. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to claims 16-18, 21 and 24-26.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15, 19, 20, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-2002313226 to Osamu et al. ("Osamu"), in view of JP-11254237 to Tsugio et al. ("Tsugio"). This rejection is traversed for the reasons advanced in detail below.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the Abstract and FIG. 4A of Tsugio discloses forming a first film pattern by a droplet discharge method. Further, the Examiner asserts that Abstract and FIG. 1 of Osamu discloses forming a mask pattern by irradiating a region where the first film pattern and the photosensitive material are overlapped with a laser beam and by developing. *See, page 3 of the Office Action.*

Without conceding in detail the merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants herein amend independent claim 15 to recite, "forming a first film pattern over a substrate by a droplet discharge method" (*emphasis added*). Applicants further herein amend independent

claim 15 to recite the feature of “forming a mask pattern by irradiating a region where the first film pattern and the photosensitive material are overlapped with a laser beam while changing a relative position between the substrate and the laser beam and by developing” (*emphasis added*). These amendments are supported by, for example, paragraphs [0085]-[0090] of the instant application’s publication, U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2008/0246036 A1 (“the ‘036 publication”). According to paragraphs [0085] and [0090] of the ‘036 publication, laser irradiation is performed while moving a substrate or while scanning a laser beam.

Applicants submit that Osamu and/or Tsugio, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, suggest or render obvious at least these newly recited features of the claimed invention, particularly in combination with the other recited features of the invention. For example, neither the Abstract nor FIG. 4A of Tsugio discloses forming a first film pattern over a substrate by a droplet discharge method, and the Examiner readily admits that Osamu fails to teach this feature. *See, page 3 of the Office Action.* Further, neither the Abstract nor FIG. 1 of Osamu disclosing changing the relative position between the substrate and the laser beam while performing laser irradiation. Tsugio, cited by the Examiner only with respect to the aforementioned formation of a first film by a droplet discharge method, fails to overcome this deficiency of Osamu.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 15. The rejection of claims 19, 20, 22 and 23 is believed to be improper at least by virtue of their dependence on claims 15. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all claims of the instant application. If a conference would be helpful in expediting prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON PEABODY, LLP
/Jeffrey L. Costellia, Reg.#35,483/
Jeffrey L. Costellia
Registration No. 35,483

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000